

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

MATTER #: IGT1P042.WO & W

EXAMINING AUTHORITY ATTY: 380

To:
DAVID P. OLYNICK
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
2030 ADDISON STREET
P.O. BOX 778, 7TH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704

ACTION(S): RESPONSE TO WRITTEN
OPINION & IDS

DUE DATE(S): 10-12-02
11-12-02 ~~NOT DUE~~

DOCKETED: 8-20-02 BY: LN

AUDITED BY: CW

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

12 AUG 2002

Applicant's or agent's file reference

IGT1P042.WO

REPLY DUE

within 2 months/days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/US01/32368

International filing date (day/month/year)

15 October 2001 (15.10.2001)

Priority date (day/month/year)

19 October 2000 (19.10.2000)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): A63F 9/24; G07F 17/32 and US Cl.: 463/42

Applicant

INTERNATIONAL GAME TECHNOLOGY

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☒ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 19 February 2003 (19.02.2003)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile No. (703)305-3230

Authorized officer

M. Sager

Telephone No. 703-308-0858

Shelia Veney
Shelia Veney
Paralegal Specialist
Group 3700

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US01/32368

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-35, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 36-43, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-10, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages none _____
- ☒ the claims, Nos. none _____
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig none _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US01/32368

III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1. The question whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
☒ claims Nos. 15-47

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require international preliminary examination (*specify*):

- ☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

- ☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 15-47.

2. A written opinion cannot be drawn due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:

- ☐ the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.
☐ the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US01/32368

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>2 and 9-14</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1 and 3-8</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-14</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-14</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1 and 3-8 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Pease (5759102).

Claims 2 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Pease in view of Johnson (5923885). Pease discloses the invention but lacks firewall. However it is known as admitted by background disclosure remote gaming (1:16-4:23) with a plurality of entities. Specifically, to protect sensitive data in a network a firewall is used for increasing security or to protect the data. Johnson discloses method or system using a firewall to protect sensitive data in a network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a routineer to add firewall as known and disclosed by Johnson to Pease's game to protect sensitive data.

Claims 9-14 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Pease in view of Brown (5921947) and Boushy (5761647). Pease discloses the invention but lacks the plurality of entities and the privileges claimed therein. However, it is known for a plurality of entities to own terminals and software such as affiliates and for remote gaming (1:16-4:23). Boushy further demonstrates a plurality of entities owning terminals and software components which inherently have privileges. Also, Brown teaches entities and the privileges in a network to permit access for entities with appropriate privileges while protecting data therein. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a routineer at a time prior to the invention to add the plurality of entites and privileges as claimed as suggested by Boushy in conjunction with Brown to Pease game system and method to permit access while protecting data therein.

Claims 1-14 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(4), because the prior art has industrial applicability as gaming terminal data repository.

NEW CITATIONS

US 5761647 A (BOUSHY) 02 June 1998, 2:5-3:30, See figs 1-12.

US 5923885 A (JOHNSON et al) 13 July 1999, 5:66-6:32.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US01/32368

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.